

REMARKS

Summary of the Office Action

Claims 1-43 are pending.

Claims 1-43 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e).

Applicants' Response

In this amendment and response, Applicants address the Examiner's rejections. Support for the amendments can be found throughout the application. (*See*, e.g., pages 13-15 and 29 of the specification). As such, no new matter has been added. Applicants' silence with regard to the Examiner's rejections of the dependent claims constitutes recognition by the Applicants that the rejections are moot based on Applicants' Remarks relative to the independent claim from which the dependent claims depend. Upon entry of the Amendment, claims 1-43 are pending. Applicants respectfully traverse all rejections of record.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e)

Claims 1-43 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as allegedly anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 4,712,248 to Hongo. ("Hongo").

In order to show that claims 1-43 are anticipated, the Examiner must show that "each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference." MPEP § 2131; *Verdegall Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California*, 814 F.2d 628, 631 (Fed. Cir. 1987).

Applicants respectfully submit that Hongo does not show "each and every element" of the claims.

Independent claim 1 is directed to a system for creating a description record from multimedia information. Among other things, the system of claim 1 comprises a computer processor that processes said multimedia information by performing object extraction processing to create multimedia object descriptions from said multimedia information, said object descriptions associated with distinct multimedia objects, and processing said created multimedia object descriptions by object hierarchy processing to create multimedia object hierarchy descriptions indicative of an organization of said object descriptions and said multimedia objects wherein at least one description record including said multimedia object descriptions and said multimedia object hierarchy descriptions is created for content embedded within said multimedia information wherein said description record allows for searching said multimedia descriptions for said embedded content. Independent claims 17 and 33 recite similar features.

In the Office Action, the Examiner cites a number of figures and passages in Hongo as allegedly disclosing the features of independent claims 1, 17, and 33. Applicants respectfully disagree. Hongo is directed to an object identification system and method that determines points within an object's boundary corresponding to abrupt changes in the object's profile. (*See Hongo*, Abstract). As part of the described object identification method, Hongo divides individual objects into so-called "primitive-elements," the primitive elements consisting of: (a) straight lines or segments, (b) circles or arcs and (c) ellipses or elliptical arcs. (*See Hongo*, col. 5, line 48- col. 6, line 11; Figs. 4 and 5).

As noted above, among other things, as amended, the system of claim 1 features a computer processor that processes created multimedia object descriptions by object hierarchy processing to create multimedia object hierarchy descriptions indicative of an

organization of object descriptions and associated distinct multimedia objects. The Examiner alleges that that Figure 9 and column 9, lines 25-40 of Hongo disclose object hierarchy processing as featured in claim 1. (*See* Office Action, page 3). Applicants respectfully disagree.

The cited portion of Hongo describes steps involved in the extraction and identification of a single object. While Hongo does briefly mention hierarchical structures, it does so only in the context of decomposing single objects into “primitive elements” as part of the object identification process. Specifically, Hongo describes:

Based on the above description, *an object* can be represented by a hierarchical structure as shown in FIG. 9. That is, an object is made up of some blobs, and each blob is made up of one outer periphery...and some inner peripheries...In the above-described example, the peripheries are divided into the primitive elements PR1 through PR5 which have attribute values ATT-1 through ATT-5, respectively...As long as *primitive elements* are numbered according to the rule which is predetermined for tracing a boundary, the arrangement of the primitive elements can be known from a hierarchical structure tree diagram as shown in FIG. 9. (Hongo, col. 9, lines 25-40, emphasis added).

The cited passage describes representing a *single object* as a collection of predefined primitive elements and uses a hierarchical structure tree diagram to represent the arrangement of said predefined primitive elements. Further, it performs these steps *during the identification process* of said single object. Unlike the system of claim 1, Hongo is not directed to a hierarchical structure describing the arrangement of multiple extracted objects and multimedia object descriptions, but instead represents individual objects as predefined primitive elements. As noted above, Hongo describes primitive

elements as predefined shapes consisting of: (a) straight lines or segments, (b) circles or arcs and (c) ellipses or elliptical arcs which are used in identifying objects. Further, Figure 9, also cited by the Examiner, describes a single object, Object-A, represented as a series of layers: object layer, blob layer, periphery layer, primitive layer, and an attribute layer, but still fails to disclose or suggest a hierarchical structure describing the arrangement of *multiple already extracted objects* and multimedia object descriptions from a scene and how the objects relate to *each other* as featured in claim 1.

The system of claim 1 also features at least one description record including multimedia object descriptions and multimedia object hierarchy descriptions that is created for content embedded within said multimedia information wherein said description record allows for searching said multimedia descriptions for said embedded content. Because Hongo fails to disclose or suggest multimedia object hierarchy descriptions as featured in claim 1, it cannot disclose a description record that includes at least those multimedia hierarchy descriptions.

Further, the Examiner cites column 3, lines 10-15 of Hongo as allegedly disclosing this feature, but the cited portion of Hongo merely describes inputting a video signal into a system before any object extraction processing or creation of object descriptions has taken place *at all*. Specifically, the cited portion of Hongo describes, “[t]he feature extracting circuit **22** divides the binary-coded image into picture elements having a predetermined size, extracts data on each picture elements or on a segment representing a series of picture elements in a horizontal scanning line, and writes the data in the image memory **23** in a DMA (direct memory access) mode.” (Hongo, col. 3, lines 10-16). Hongo further describes, “[t]he image processor **24** performs a predetermined image process operation

and an object identification process operation according to data read out of the image memory 23.” (Hongo, col. 3, lines 17-20). Though the Examiner alleges that col. 3, lines 10-15 of Hongo describe a description record including multimedia object descriptions and multimedia object hierarchy descriptions that is created for content embedded within said multimedia information, as featured in claim 1, it is clear from the passage above that the cited portion describes steps that are taken before any object processing is done at all. Assuming, *arguendo*, that Hongo does describe creating multimedia object descriptions and multimedia object hierarchy descriptions as featured in claim 1 elsewhere in its Specification, the cited portion merely describes inputting video signals into a system before any object identification or processing takes place, and it cannot disclose or suggest creating a description record as featured in claim 1.

Applicants also note that as amended, the description record featured in claim 1 also allows for searching said multimedia information for said embedded content. Hongo also fails to disclose or suggest this feature of claim 1. While Hongo is directed to individual object identification generally and describes representing objects as predefined primitive objects as part of the identification process, there is no suggestion or disclosure of description records that allow for searches of embedded multimedia content, as featured in claim 1.

Applicants respectfully submit that claim 1 should be allowed for at least these reasons. Independent claims 17 and 33 recite similar features and should also be allowed for at least these same reasons. Since independent claims 1, 17 and 33 are allowable, their respective dependent claims, 2-16, 18-32, and 34-43, are also allowable.

Based on the foregoing amendment and remarks, Applicants traverse the Examiner’s rejections of claims 1-43 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e).

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, favorable consideration and allowance of claims 1-43 are respectfully solicited. In the event that the application is not deemed in condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at (212) 408-2538 in an effort to advance the prosecution of this application.

Respectfully submitted,



Robert L. Maier
PTO Reg. No. 54,291

Paul A. Ragusa
PTO Reg. No. 38,587

Attorneys for Applicants
BAKER BOTTS L.L.P.
30 Rockefeller Plaza
New York, NY 10112